

BRIEF HISTORY  
OF THE  
WARS AND TREATIES

IN WHICH

*England has been engaged*

FROM THE

RESTORATION OF KING CHARLES II.

*To the present Time.*

WITH A

SKETCH OF THE CAUSES

OF THE

FRENCH REVOLUTION,

AND OF THE

MOTIVES WHICH LED TO THE WAR BETWEEN  
THE CONFEDERATE PRINCES,

AND THE

FRENCH NATION.

---

“At the conclusion of a ten years’ war, how are we recompensed for the death of multitudes and the expence of millions, but by contemplating the sudden glories of pay-masters and agents, contractors and commissaries, whose equipages shine like meteors, and whose palaces rise like exhalations?”

“These are the men, who, without virtue, labour, or hazard, are growing rich as their country is impoverished; they rejoice when obstinacy or ambition adds another year to slaughter and devastation; and laugh from their desks at bravery and science, while they are adding figure to figure, and cypher to cypher, hoping for a new contract from a new armament, and computing the profit of a siege or tempest.”

DR. JOHNSON.

---

LONDON:

Printed for G. G. and J. ROBINSON, Paternoster-Row.

M,DCC,XC,VI.

1860

231

...

...

...

...

...

## ADVERTISEMENT.

---

THE following pages were written with a design to expose the folly and wickedness of wars in general, by bringing into view, the principles from which they have originated, and the slaughter, expence, and calamity which have invariably attended them.

From this little work, even the *alarmist* has nothing to apprehend. It contains no *speculative sentiments*—no *new-fangled doctrines*, tending to subvert the *constitution*, or to alienate the minds of the people from the person of his *Majesty*.—It is a plain narrative of facts, extracted from the Histories of England, and the most popular and esteemed writers of the present time.

In offering it to the public, the object of the compiler is, to propagate the truth, to give information to those who have not opportunity to read voluminous works on subjects which this narrative embraces, and to remove that prejudice, which, unhappily, in his opinion, influences too many in their choice of parties; and, he is persuaded, that a cool and deliberate consideration of the *causes and consequences* of past wars, will operate to diminish the love of *military glory* which characterizes, in a particular manner, the advocates of the present disastrous conflict.





A

BRIEF HISTORY, &c.

---

ALL wars are, by their authors and advocates, deemed just and necessary. The mad and unprincipled wars of our own country, in the latter end of the last century, and the beginning of this, were, by the monarch, the ministers, and the courtly minions of the time, said to be just and necessary; just, for the defence of the people's rights, and necessary for the honour and interest of the nation: but now, every person, the least acquainted with the motives of caprice and ambition, in which many of those wars originated, must acknowledge that they were unjust, unnecessary, and highly disgraceful to the nation that supported them. The present contest with France is said, by its abettors, to be not only just and necessary, but undertaken for the preservation of our liberties, our religion, and for the very existence of society itself: but in a succeeding generation, when the motives which led to the dispute, and the influence of party have ceased to operate; when men coolly and impartially exercise their judgments on the political conduct of their ancestors, perhaps then, the nation may, with *one voice*, pronounce it as unprincipled and disgraceful as those wars alluded to above, which are now, universally regarded with disapprobation and abhorrence.

To be convinced of the impolicy and injustice of continental wars and continental alliances,

B



alliances, it is sufficient to be acquainted with the views with which they have been entered into; and even in those few instances, when the fortune of war has favoured the ministers with what they call noble achievements! glorious victories! and unparalleled success! the nation has been invariably a loser, and has had to lament, at the end of an obstinate dispute, her millions expended, her taxes increased, and her thousands slain.

It is an established axiom in politics, that *war cannot be justified, unless it originates in the principle of self-defence, after every means have been used in vain to avoid it.* Having stated this as the only ground upon which a nation can justly hazard a contest, I shall proceed to give a brief detail of the principal wars and treaties in which England has been engaged since the Restoration, leaving it to the candid reader to determine, whether the numerous acts of hostility, during the last 130 years, which have brought upon the nation a debt of upwards of *three hundred millions of money*, have been more frequently commenced to defend the rights of the people, or to gratify the ambition of kings, and to answer the temporary purposes of wicked and mercenary ministers.

On the 29th of May, 1660, Charles II. was restored to the throne. In 1664, he declared war against Holland, upon very frivolous pretences: Two English ships had been taken by the Dutch, and though they offered to make a proper compensation, Charles would not accept it; but immediately proceeded to hostilities. After three years war, both

both sides were equally weary, and a peace was concluded at Breda on the 10th of July, 1667.

In January, 1668, the famous treaty, called the triple alliance, was concluded at the Hague, between the English, the Dutch, and the Swedes; the object of which was, to check the ambition of Louis, King of France; but in 1670, Charles broke the triple alliance, and entered into a league with France; and in March, 1672, both Charles and Louis declared war against Holland, with which Charles had, just before, entered into a league against France. In Feb. 1674, a peace was concluded between England and Holland. Charles would gladly have continued this war longer, but his faithful Commons would grant him no more supplies. Louis continued the war against Holland four years longer, and before the peace was concluded, Charles was prevailed upon to enter into an offensive alliance with the Dutch, and to put a stop to the progress of the French arms; for this purpose, he assembled a formidable fleet, and raised an army of 30,000 men; but after all these mighty boasts and preparations, he suddenly changed his mind, and left the Dutch to conclude a peace upon the best terms they could. Louis having no hopes of accomplishing his ambitious projects, was glad to conclude a peace with Holland. The treaty was signed at Nimeguen, in August 1678.

James II. ascended the throne in 1685, and abdicated it in 1688. During his short reign, his schemes were chiefly directed to subvert the  
the



the liberties of the people, and to establish the popish religion.

William III. ascended the throne in 1689. The first steps of his reign were taken to defend himself against James and his popish confederates. In respect to foreign wars, William's grand object was to humble the pride of the French King, and with this view he entered into a confederacy with the Emperor, the King of Spain, the United Provinces, the Duke of Savoy, the Elector of Brandenburg, which potentates severally declared war against Louis in 1689; and in 1697, after a war of *eight years*, bloody and expensive, a peace was concluded at Ryfwick, in Holland; the principal article of which, relating to King William, was, *that he should be acknowledged King of Great Britain.*

This war, in which William engaged from motives of ambition, shews the melancholy effects of entering into continental alliances, on conditions, which have always been the misfortune of England. *Thirty millions sterling* expended, and *one hundred thousand men* slain upon the continent, were not the only evils attending the contest. While blood and devastation marked the military operations abroad, poverty, famine, and distress, raged at home. William being the principal of the confederacy, had the expence of the confederacy to support. It was then, as it has been in the present war, that corn was exported in the greatest abundance to feed our allies; in consequence of which, in England, it was double, and in Scotland, four times its ordinary price; and in one of those years, in  
Scotland,



Scotland alone, *eighty thousand poor people* (says Dalrymple) *died of want*. About this time (1697) the death of Charles II. King of Spain, seemed rapidly approaching, and having no issue, a vacancy on the throne would eventually take place. The competitors for the Spanish crown, were the Electoral Prince of Bavaria, the Arch-duke Charles, and the Dauphin of France, who were, all of them related to the royal family of Spain. William would gladly have procured the whole crown of Spain for the Arch-duke Charles, but judging that impossible, he entered into a *secret* negociation with the French King, for making a partition of the Spanish monarchy, and after several consultations on the subject, they agreed, without the consent, or even the knowledge of Charles, to parcel out the territories of Spain, as it suited their interest, or ambition. In this treaty (which was called the partition treaty) it was stipulated, that the Electoral Prince of Bavaria was to succeed to the crown of Spain, and the other two competitors were to obtain a considerable part of its extensive dominions. This treaty of partition (says Smollett) was one of the most impudent schemes of encroachment, that tyranny and injustice ever planned. Louis had been in the practice of sacrificing all ties of honour and good faith, to the interest of his pride, vanity, and ambition; and William engaged in a plan for dismembering a kingdom, in despite of the natives, and in violation of every law, human or divine. This treaty was signed in August, 1698, but before it took effect, the Electoral Prince died, and

a new partition-treaty was immediately concluded, by which it was stipulated, that the Arch-duke Charles was to inherit the crown of Spain, and the Dauphin to receive a proper equivalent. The intriguing measures of William and Louis, were, however, betrayed by some unfaithful ministers of the contracting parties, and communicated to Charles, who was exasperated at the insolence of foreign powers pretending to parcel out his dominions while he was alive; the people took alarm at the prospect of having their kingdom dismembered; and above all, the placemen and pensioners of the court, repined at the thought of losing their power and profit.

Louis, whose sincerity in concluding the second treaty of partition, had been suspected, availed himself of the prevalent discontent of the people, and exerted his interest with so much success at the court of Madrid, that he prevailed with Charles to make a will in favour of Philip, the Duke of Anjou, second son to the Dauphin, and as soon as the death of Charles was known (which happened November the first, 1700) he sent his grandson, the Duke of Anjou, into Spain, to support his cause by force of arms. This perfidious conduct of Louis, inflamed William with the highest indignation, and in order to chastise the French King, he formed a new alliance with Holland and the empire, but his death, in March, 1702, prevented the execution of his design\*.

\* It may not be improper here to remark, that in William's reign was formed a new system of national policy. "The sums granted



Ann ascended the throne in 1702, and immediately proceeded to prosecute the design

granted by the parliament to prosecute the war, as principals, on the continent, were so unusually great, that it was not thought advisable to raise the expences of any one year by taxes to be levied within that year, lest the unaccustomed weight of them should create murmurs among the people. It was, therefore, the bad policy of the times, to anticipate the revenues of their posterity, by borrowing immense sums for the current service of the state, and to lay no more taxes upon the subject, than would suffice to pay the annual interest of the sums so borrowed: by this means converting the principal debt into a new species of property, transferrable from one man to another, at any time, and in any quantity." This laid the foundation of what is called the *National Debt*, the increasing evil of which predicts, eventually, the ruin of the state.

This subject is more particularly elucidated by the ingenious remarks of another popular writer;—"The system itself is precisely the same as to government, that mortgaging the revenue of an estate to raise a present sum of money, is to the individual. The income mortgaged by the individual arises, perhaps, from land that of the state from one or more taxes, and both in the one case and in the other, this mortgage is for the payment of the interest of the sum borrowed. The individual generally engages to repay the principal when demanded, the state never does this, but while the interest is regularly discharged, and the country is tolerably prosperous, the security given by the state being transferable, finds a ready market, and thus the absorption of the capital, as far as respects the creditor of the state, is in a great measure remedied.

The convenience of the funding system, to those who administer the governments of Europe, is obvious.—It enables them, on the commencement of wars, to multiply their resources for the moment, perhaps, twenty fold. Previous to this invention a tax, raising 500,000l. annually, would strengthen the hands of government by this sum only, but under the funding system, the tax being mortgaged for ever for as much money as it would pay the annual interest of, brought into the treasury the capital sum at once, that is ten, or perhaps twelve, millions. It is true, this spendthrift expenditure must bring a day of reckoning—But what then? Those who administer the public revenue, are not owners of the estate, but in general tenants at will or at most, having a life interest in it only. The practice of mortgaging the public revenue during wars, prevents the people from feeling the immediate pressure of the expence, by transferring it, in a great measure, to posterity. Ministers look to the moment, and delight in expedients that may delay the evil day. When it comes, it does not in all probability fall on those with whom the mischief originated. ---They are no longer in power; they are, perhaps, in their graves, and deaf to the wrongs of their injured country."

which

which her predecessor had formed, to humble the pride of the Bourbon family, by depriving Philip of the crown of Spain, and compelling the French King to adhere to the second treaty of partition. Accordingly war was declared against France, on the fourth of May, 1702, by England, Holland, and the Empire, and after it had been prosecuted *eleven years*, with various success, a peace was concluded, and signed at Utrecht, on the eleventh of April, 1713.---*But the grand object for which the war had been undertaken was finally abandoned. King Philip was left in quiet possession of the Spanish crown.*---During this war, one of the *most glorious and complete victories* was obtained over the French, that ever was recorded in history---*ten thousand* French and Bavarians were slain in the field of battle. The greater part of thirty squadrons of dragoons were drowned in the Danube, *thirty thousand* men were made prisoners of war, including 1200 officers; 100 pieces of cannon were taken, together with 24 mortars, and 129 colours; 171 standards, 17 pair of kettle drums, 3600 tents, 34 coaches, 300 laden mules, two bridges of boats, and 15 barrels and eight casks of silver---But, notwithstanding these signal acquisitions, the nation was a considerable loser; for the expence of the war, as stated by Sir John Sinclair, amounted to £.43,360,003, which made a serious addition to the national debt, and to the taxes that were laid on the people to pay the interest of it.

George I. ascended the throne in 1714, and in the year following attempts were made in  
favour



favour of the Pretender. The French King, notwithstanding his solemn engagements by treaty with his Britannic Majesty, assisted him privately with money, and encouraged him to expect to ascend the throne of England; but with the death of Louis XIV. which happened in September, 1715, expired, for a time, the interest of the Pretender in France, and the hopes of his adherents in Great-Britain.

Soon after the accession of George to the British throne, he prevailed with the generosity of the English Parliament, to advance him money, to purchase of Frederic IV. King of Denmark, the German Duchies of Bremen and Verden, which he had conquered from Charles XII. King of Sweden; but Charles denied the right of Frederic to sell, and of George to buy them; and the contract so exasperated Charles, that he determined to attempt the invasion of England, and place the Pretender upon the throne. On the other hand, the English began to prepare an armament to counteract his design, and accordingly a large squadron of ships were sent into the Baltic, to observe the motion of the Swedes, and preparations were made for internal defence.

In November, 1718, the King of Sweden was slain by a cannon-ball at Frederickstadt, an event that, in some measure, terminated the dispute with Sweden, and secured Bremen and Verden to the house of Hanover. An acquisition (says Smollet) made in contradiction to the engagements into which England entered, when King William became



guarantee for the treaty of Travendahl: An acquisition that may be considered as the first link of a political chain, by which the English nation was dragged back into expensive connections with the continent.

King George had not yet received the investiture of the Duchies, and till that should be procured, it was thought necessary to espouse, with warmth, the interest of the Emperor; this was a source of misunderstanding between England and Spain; and after triple alliances and quadruple alliances between Great Britain, and the quarrelsome powers on the continent, among whom England has been ever ready to take a busy part; after repeated complaints of the Spaniards of breaches of faith in the British court; and, after retorts of the British court upon the Spaniards, for the violation of sacred treaties; after great preparations, at great expence on both sides; war was declared against Spain, in December, 1718, and after the Emperor, as the ally of England, had driven the Spaniards entirely out of Sicily, the King of Spain was compelled to accede to the quadruple alliance, which had been previously formed between the Empire, Great Britain, France, and Holland. This event brought into close alliance and good friendship, George, the Emperor, Louis, Philip, and the States General. In the year 1719, his Britannic Majesty went over to the continent, where he concluded a peace with Sweden, by which Bremen and Verden were yielded to the House of Hanover; and thus another power was brought into pacific terms with Great-Britain.



The negociation carried on, and the treaties concluded, by George I. with almost every Prince and state in Christendom, and which followed one another in such rapid succession, and all for the protection of the petty dominions of Hanover, were so numerous and intricate, that it would exceed the limits of the present sketch to detail them. He was entangled in such a variety of treaties and interests, that it exceeded the capacity of his wisest ministers, to extricate him from the troublesome engagements he had contracted. It is sufficient to observe, that the continental broils, arming and disarming, manning and unmanning, in his reign, cost the nation £.6,048,267.

George II. ascended the throne in 1727, and in 1729 a treaty was concluded at Seville, between Great-Britain, France, and Spain, by which all former conventions between England and Spain were confirmed, and King George assured the Parliament, that the peace of Europe was firmly established; but this treaty gave great offence to the Emperor, because it was made without his knowledge or consent, and he began to make preparations for war, but his finances were not in a condition to enable him to hazard a contest, and the bustle on one side, and alarm on the other, terminated in a treaty, signed at Vienna, between George and the Emperor, in March, 1731. This treaty gave offence to the King of Spain, who declared, that he considered himself no longer bound to observe that of Seville, and the Spaniards began to renew their depredations upon the ships of  
the



the British merchants, who carried on an illicit trade in their dominions ; however, the court of Madrid found it convenient to accede to the treaty of Vienna soon after ; but notwithstanding this, the Spaniards still interrupted the navigation of English ships in the American seas, and continued to search them, till England began to prepare for war, which so intimidated the King of Spain, that he agreed to a treaty, signed at Pardo, by which it was stipulated, among other things, that he should pay his Britannic Majesty £.95,000, as a compensation for injuries sustained by the British merchants ; but in opposition to this sum, his Catholic Majesty made a claim of £.68,000, owing to him by the South-Sea Company, for *duty on Negroes*. The treaty of Pardo, however, did not clearly explain matters respecting the Spaniard's right of searching the British ships, and this misunderstanding led to a war between the two powers, which was declared on both sides in the latter end of 1739. His Christian Majesty, notwithstanding the solemn engagements existing between Great-Britain and France, and his professions of friendship to his Britannic Majesty, declared, that he was bound by treaty with Spain, and must, therefore, assist his Catholic Majesty, and soon after formed a design to invade Great-Britain, and place the Pretender upon the throne. During this war of England against France and Spain, which terminated in a peace at Aix-la-Chapelle, in 1748, after a contest of *nine years*, the powers on the continent were at war one with another : The King of Prussia invaded



invaded Silesia, and the Queen of Hungary projected a plan to invade the dominions of the King of Prussia, and to divide them between herself and her allies, *of which, England, it is asserted, was one*, and the King of France undertook to invade the dominions of the Hungarian Queen, and to place the Elector of Bavaria upon the Imperial throne, who was afterwards chosen Emperor of Germany. And though England had herself to defend against rebellion at home, she was nevertheless involved in those complicated contests abroad. The interference of his Britannic Majesty, in continental schemes, with a view to the security of Hanover, has ever been detrimental to the interests of Britain. Large subsidies were granted, and enormous sums voted, to *eight different foreign powers,\** and foreign troops were taken into British pay, to regulate the affairs of the Empire, as it suited the interests of that puny Electorate. For, whenever a war breaks out on the continent, in which the Elector of Hanover engages, England becomes the pay-master-general of the powers whose cause *he* espouses,----and she pays her cash with an unsparing hand. The expences of the war begun 1739, Sir J. Sinclair states at £.46,418,689.

Notwithstanding the treaty of Aix-la Chapelle, which concluded a war, in which no-

\* In 1746, 300,000*l.* was voted to the King of Sardinia, 400,000*l.* to the Queen of Hungary.---Subsidies were granted to the Dutch, the Hessians, the Saxons, the Hanoverians, the Elector for Mentz and Cologne.---In the next session, 430,000*l.* was voted to the Queen of Hungary, and the other continental powers experienced the usual bounty of the English parliament.

thing was gained by any party; but the experience of each other's strength and resources, peace was not of long continuance. The cessation of hostilities was only an interval of repose, in which the nation might recruit its strength to fight again. In 1754-5, a dispute arising between England and France, concerning a tract of land in the back parts of America, each party charging the other as the aggressor, involved the two nations in an *eight years* contest, when, as an eloquent writer observes, had the parties interested alone been consulted, a jury of twelve men might have settled the difference. The French King, among other plans he had formed for distressing the English nation, made no secret of his design to invade Hanover---a feather in the wing of his Britannic Majesty, of such a sensitive nature, that the slightest touch with which it is affected conveys to his mind the most astonishing alarm. For the security of his German dominions, he entered into a treaty with the Empress of Russia, and agreed to pay her an annual subsidy of £.500,000 sterling, to keep in readiness a number of troops on the frontiers of Livonia, and subsidiary treaties, as usual, were entered into with different powers on the continent, amongst whom the King of Prussia (whose dominions his Britannic Majesty had, a few years before, assisted the Queen of Hungary to invade) received annually £.670,000 sterling, during the continuance of the war, and foreign troops were taken into British pay; but Saxony and Bavaria, notwithstanding the subsidies they had received from England during *three years*

*of*



of peace, entered into opposite connections, laughing, no doubt, “ at the credulity of the English nation, in supposing honour and gratitude to be ties obligatory upon Princes.” In 1756, his Britannic Majesty demanded of his cordial ally, the Queen of Hungary, the troops that had been stipulated by treaty; but though he had assisted her, even in her distress, in the late war, she refused to comply with the requisition, and the court of Vienna, to the surprise of all the world, entered into an alliance with its former rival, the court of France, to which treaty, the Empress of Russia, notwithstanding her having *condescended to agree with England for a subsidy the year before*, acceded without hesitation. He then made a demand on the States General, who were engaged, by treaty, to furnish Great Britain with 6000 men, when she should be threatened with an invasion, but through the influence of the French minister at the Hague, who represented to the Dutch, that the English were the aggressors, and from their own aversion to war, the demand of his Britannic Majesty was not complied with. Notwithstanding these disappointments, Great-Britain, with the faithful allies she had left, proceeded like a heroic warrior, to contend against the arms of France and her confederates. The war was prosecuted during the remainder of George II. [who was succeeded in 1760 by his present most gracious Sovereign] with various success. In the West-Indies and North-America, fortune alternately favoured the contending parties, though eventually victory was more favourable to the English. In Germany, Hanover, the favourite post of his  
Britannic

Britannic Majesty, was three times alternately possessed and abandoned by the French, and the rest of the continent experienced those grievous calamities, and desolating evils, which are ever attendant upon war. Towards the latter end of this dreadful contest, Spain, who had long observed a neutrality, began to blend her interests with those of France. The two courts had entered into a treaty, known by the name of the *family compact*; and as it was suspected that Spain would soon act an hostile part against Great-Britain, war was declared by his Britannic Majesty against that power, in January, 1762, but in the following year all parties were equally weary. The resources of England were nearly exhausted; men could not be procured without ~~the~~ great difficulty, and the enormous sums required to continue the war, became oppressive upon the people. *In plain terms, both sides were so weakened with the the loss of blood and treasure, that they could fight no longer,* and a peace was concluded on the 10th of February, 1763.

This war is said to have been the most fortunate in which England ever engaged; 100 ships of war were destroyed or taken from the enemy, and £.12,000,000 sterling acquired in plunder, besides immense acquisitions on the continent of North-America. But these victories unheard of, and successes ever glorious! cost the nation £.111,271,996 sterling, and 250,000 lives---*such was the indemnity which England obtained for the past.*

The flames of war, however, were no sooner extinguished in one quarter, than they were  
lighted



lighted up in another. England was not long to enjoy the blessings of peace and prosperity. In the course of recovering her natural strength and affluence, she was again interrupted by the unhappy and calamitous contest with the American colonies, which broke out in 1775. Whether the Americans should be taxed, without their consent, by the English Parliament, in which they had not one representative, was the subject of dispute. The English government insisted upon a right to bind them, *in all cases whatever*. *Unconditional submission* was the haughty language of Lord North; while they, on the other hand, wished for “*a reconciliation, upon just and reasonable terms*.” But to this pacific reasoning, the ministers of the crown exhibited the gun and the bayonet, as tokens of slavery or death. Though England entered into the war against America alone, the powers with whom she imagined herself secure in treaty and alliance, took up the contest against her. Treaties of peace are never regarded by despotic sovereigns, when they stand in competition with their interest or ambition. At the commencement of hostilities, Great-Britain was at peace with France, and Spain, and Russia and Holland were called her natural and faithful allies; but France, without any provocation from England, openly declared in favour of America; and Spain, upon the same unjustifiable principles, followed the same conduct.---Russia took advantage of the defenceless state of England, to rob her of that sovereignty of the sea, which had long been the boast of Britain, and

published her manifesto, under the name of the armed neutrality.

Under these discouraging circumstances, the English ambassador, at the Hague, demanded of the States-General, the succours which were stipulated by treaty, but these were not only refused, but the Dutch espoused the cause of America.

After a contest of *seven years*, in which England lost 200,000 lives, and expended £.139,171,876 sterling, she was compelled to grant to the *arms* of America, what she had haughtily refused to her *prayers*, and peace was signed at Paris, on the third of September, 1783, by which Great-Britain *acknowledged the thirteen provinces of North America—free, sovereign, and independent States*, and might have learned this very wholesome and salutary lesson, that—*a people fighting in the cause of liberty, and determined to be free, will ultimately prevail.*

The bloody and expensive conflict with America was succeeded by a period of tranquillity, and as the Prime Minister had professed himself an advocate for the pacific system, the people were flattered with a continuance of the blessings of peace. But the sentiments of men, and especially statesmen, frequently change with their situations. In 1790, the British court was involved in a dispute with Spain, respecting a settlement which some English adventurers had established on that part of the North-west coast of America, called Nootka Sound. The court of Madrid repeatedly offered to submit the  
dispute



dispute to be determined by existing treaties ; his Catholic Majesty condescended so far as to request, that the whole might be peaceably referred to the decision of any one crowned head in Europe, leaving it to his Britannic Majesty himself to name the Royal personage, by whom it might be determined ; and the minister of a neutral power, then resident in London, publickly declared, that he would undertake to settle the dispute to Mr. Pitt's satisfaction for *forty guineas*, the current expences of a messenger to Madrid. But the minister of peace was now become a minister of *preparation*. Mr. Pitt was determined to arm before he condescended to negotiate ; but, happily for both nations, the wisdom or the weakness of Spain, after some ineffectual endeavours to bring the matter to a reference, yielded to the full demands of Great Britain ; but what is most singular in this transaction is, that the trade to Nootka, for which the immense sum of *four millions* was incurred, has never been thought worth reviving, nor could it at any time have been worth the expence of £.100 to the nation.

This period was particularly distinguished for warlike preparations. The armament against Spain was succeeded by another against Russia, more unnecessarily begun, and more disgracefully ended. That the city of Ocza-kow, in Budziac Tartary, should be in possession of the Porte, then at war with Russia, as necessary to preserve the *Balance of power*,\*  
was

\* It is curious to observe what little things will sometimes excite an alarm in great men. The small city of Oczakow was thought of sufficient weight in the balance of power to risk the expences

was regarded as a sufficient plea for involving the nation in the calamities of war. The minister had a large majority in parliament for proceeding to hostilities, but the unpopularity of his measures, in the minds of the people, induced him to give up the point respecting Oczakow, which was left in possession of the Empress, after an immense expence on the part of the minister in an useless armament \*.

The nation had not long ceased from hostile preparations, when the flattering prospect of national peace and prosperity, held out by the minister in the beginning of 1792, was clouded by the approach of the present portentous contest with France. As the origin of this war must be sought for in the rise and progress of the French Revolution, the consequences of which have involved most of the European powers in the disastrous conflict, the causes which operated to pro-

expences of a war with Russia; but when the Empress, without the least shadow of a right, invaded Poland; and annexed to her own dominions, the most considerable part of that kingdom, the whole of which has been swallowed up by her, and the powers of Austria and Prussia, the English minister viewed the unjustifiable conduct of the Imperial plunderers with indifference and unconcern.

\* The pointed remarks of Mr. Sheridan, on the motion for censure on ministers, on this occasion, manifestly shew; the inconsistency of their measures—"If any friend," said he, "were to undertake to support the minister by argument, he did not see clearly in what manner they were to plead his cause. If they maintained that Oczakow was of no consequence, they could not answer his exposing the country to the hazard of a war on account of it. If they maintained that it was of consequence to justify an armament, they could not answer his giving it up. If they said he yielded to the opinion of the house, they must be told that the majority of the house was with him; if they were to alledge that he yielded to the opinion of the public, the public opinion was against his arming."

duce



duce that important event, and the principles upon which the different powers successively entered into hostilities against the French nation, will be briefly explained in the following pages.

---

#### A SKETCH OF THE CAUSES OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION, &c.

**T**HREE causes were combined to produce a revolution in France. First, The writings of the French philosophers. Second, The part which the king took in the American war. Third, The variety of grievous oppressions that existed under the old government, and the extravagance of the French court. The first cause was slow in its operation. Popery was the religion of the state, and priestcraft was exercised to keep the minds of the people in a state of ignorance and superstition, which consequently retarded the progressive influence of reason and philosophy. The second cause illustrated the first, and quickened its operation: And, the third was of a more *palpable* nature, and required not so much the aid of philosophy to unfold. It was a fact, the force of which was sensibly felt, and at length became a common cause with the oppressed people.

The part which the King of France took in the American contest was attended with consequences unfortunate to himself. He assisted the Americans to obtain their independence, which eventually operated to the destruction of his own. The officers and soldiers that were sent to fight for America, and

saw that memorable revolution completed, returned home with new ideas of freedom, which they diffused amongst their countrymen, who already impregnated with the liberal principles of government laid down by Voltaire and Rousseau, beheld these now brought into actual exercise, by facts which were incapable either of contradiction or concealment. The natural consequence of this was, an ardent desire to be free themselves: and the establishment of American independence accelerated the downfall of despotism in France.

The public debts of that kingdom had been exceedingly heavy, and its finances much embarrassed for many years back: The intolerable burdens which war and ambition had laid upon the nation were continually increased by the enormous expences of the crown, and the profusion that prevailed during the unequalled length of the two last reigns. The American war created new and urgent necessities in the state; It involved the crown in such difficulties and distresses as compelled it to demand great and unusual supplies from the people; thereby affording them such an opportunity for speaking, thinking, and acting freely, as several reigns had not before shewn to the French nation.

The French government was arbitrary; edicts of taxation were framed by the king at his discretion, and sent to the parliaments to be registered, before which, they could not operate. On this subject, disputes had long existed between the court and the parliaments. The court insisted that the authority of the parliaments



parliaments extended no further than to remonstrate, or shew reasons against the tax, and could not, if the king was determined, prevent the edicts from being enforced. The situation of the people differed little from that of the most abject slavery, and the parliaments were accustomed to submit to the arbitrary demands of the king; but the single event of American independence, produced, in this respect, a total alteration. The parliaments, which had been before timid, complaisant, and unresisting to the royal will, now assumed a different, a firmer, and a more resolute tone. The edicts of taxation, to provide for the wants of the government after the American war, sent to be registered, met with the strongest opposition, and the parliaments asserted, in a bolder language than the king had been accustomed to hear, their right, not only to remonstrate, but to reject, whatever they disapproved.

The extravagant luxury of the court, and the prodigality in time of war, had sunk and disordered the finances beyond reformation. The revenue of £.24,000,000 was unequal to the expenditure. Committees were appointed to invent and recommend modes of taxation. The patriotic members proposed to accommodate the expences to the revenue; to abolish the state prisons, the supporting of which was attended with an enormous expence; to suppress *Lettres de Cachet*, or arbitrary imprisonment; to compel the rich to contribute to the expences of the state, as well as the poor; and, finally, to form a constitution. Against these propositions the court was obstinate, and the

the patriots were determined to enforce them, and were supported in their views by the sense of the people, who were poor and oppressed, and they knew from what source the oppression came. They were enlightened, and unanimous, and a revolution was inevitable.

The whole power in France was lodged in the court, the clergy, and the nobility. The court was arbitrary and oppressive; the clergy powerful and superstitious; and the nobility tyrannical. The king, or his ministers, (acting in his name) levied taxes at pleasure; the clergy reaped, free of all expence, the *fifth part* of the net produce of the territorial revenues of the kingdom, besides possessing immense estates, and contributed nothing, but what were termed *free-gifts*, which they imposed upon themselves at pleasure. Offices and emoluments of the state, were monopolized by the nobility, who, though possessed of prodigious property, were exempted from paying taxes, and the public charges were laid upon that class of people, which was the least able to bear them.

The despotism of the old government was carried to an excess hardly credible. By the usage of *Lettres de Cachet*, the liberty of a person was rendered precarious and uncertain, being at the will or mercy of a superior, or an enemy.\* They were to be purchased of

\* In a full meeting of the parliament, on the 7th of November, 1787, the king entered the assembly, and proposed, for their approbation, a new edict, authorising a loan of about nineteen millions sterling. A long and interesting debate ensued upon this proposal; but the king, wearied with the contest, and chagrined at the



of Government, which invested the purchaser with a power to imprison for life, or during pleasure, the person who had incurred his hatred or resentment. They were carried (says Mr. Young) to the excessive length of being sold with blanks, to be filled up with names, at the pleasure of the purchaser, who was thus enabled, in the gratification of private revenge, to tear a man from the bosom of his family, and bury him in a dungeon, where he would exist forgotten, and die unknown.\*

H

The

the freedom of some of the principal speakers, rose at length, and commanded the edict to be registered without further opposition. To the astonishment of the king, and the whole court party, this order was opposed by the Duke d'Orleans, the first prince of the blood, but the succeeding day, the Duke received an order from court to confine himself to one of his seats fifteen leagues from Paris, where he was to receive no company except his own family; and M. M. Freteau and Sabatier, who had distinguished themselves in the debate, were seized under the authority of *Lettres de Cachet*, and conveyed to different prisons. Several other instances of arbitrary imprisonment, even about this period, might be produced to shew the despotism of the French government, but these are sufficient.

\* “ Lord Albemarle, when Ambassador in France, about the year 1753, negotiating the fixing of the limits of the American Colonies, which three years after produced the war, calling one day on the Minister for Foreign Affairs, was introduced, for a few minutes, into his cabinet, while he finished a short conversation in the apartment, in which he usually received those who conferred with him. As his Lordship walked backwards and forwards in a very small room, he could not help seeing a paper, lying on the table, written in a large, legible hand, and containing a list of the prisoners in the Bastille, in which the first name was Gordon. When the Minister entered, Lord Albemarle apologized for his involuntarily remarking the paper;---the other replied, that it was not of the least consequence, for they made no secret of the names. Lord A. then said, that he had seen the name of Gordon first in the list, and he begged to know, as in all probability the person of this name was a British subject, on what account he had been put into the Bastille. The Minister told him, that he knew nothing of the matter, but would make the proper inquiries. The next time he saw Lord A. he informed him, that, on inquiring into the case of Gordon, he could find



The Nobility had, by the Feudal Law, their tenants and dependents in a state of the most humiliating vassalage. By the Feudal Law

no person that could give him the least information, on which he had had Gordon himself interrogated, who solemnly affirmed, that he had not the smallest knowledge, or even suspicion, of the cause of his imprisonment, but that he had been confined 30 years : however, added the Minister, I ordered him to be immediately released, and he is now at large." [Mr. Young's Travels in France.]

The Bastille was demolished by the Parisians on the 14th of July, 1789, from which memorable day the revolution is dated.

It will not be deemed unnecessary to mention some circumstances which preceded this event. On the 17th of June, the deputies of the people, with a view to the formation of a free government, announced themselves to the public, by the since celebrated denomination of the *National Assembly*. This bold step would naturally alarm the supporters of the existing abuses, on which alone, their riches and revenues depended. It is affirmed by some writers, that a plan was actually concerted by the court, which was hostile to every measure that promised the extension of freedom, for the dissolution of the Assembly, the seizure of its most distinguished members, and the full resumption of despotic authority ; and that the night of the 14th or 15th of July was the time fixed upon to put this plan in execution. How far this was really the case, it is not easy to determine : However, it appears to have been universally credited in Paris. That something evil was intended, the proceedings of the court sufficiently evinced. *M. Necker*, and the other ministers, known to be favourable to the views of the people, were prematurely dismissed on the 11th of July, and *Broglio*, *Foulon*, and others appointed, that were decidedly in the interest of the court, and the city of Paris was already besieged by a powerful army, aided by 100 pieces of cannon. Under these circumstances, the Parisians beheld the *Bastille* as the future destiny of the advocates of liberty, should their exertions to establish a free government prove unsuccessful. They considered its downfall as the downfall of despotism.---This fortress, which had long been thought impregnable, the citizens of Paris attacked, and triumphantly carried in a few hours, and in the face of an army of 30,000 men.

The horrors of this once miserable prison, are pathetically described in the following extract, from Miss Williams's letters, written from France, in the summer of 1790. " We drove under that porch which so many wretches have entered never to repass, and, alighting from the carriage, descended with difficulty into the dungeons, which were too low to admit of our standing upright, and so dark, that we were obliged, at noon day, to visit them with the light of a candle. We saw the hooks of those chains by which the prisoners were fastened round the neck to the



Law of some Cantons, they were subject to be yoked to the carriage of the Lord, like beasts of burden : in some, the tenants were obliged to pass whole nights in beating the ponds, that his rest might not be disturbed by the croaking of the frogs ; in others, they were compelled to maintain his hounds ; but, the most dreadful instance of Feudal barbarism, was a law (obsolete, indeed, for ages) which authorised the Lord, in certain districts, on his return from hunting, to rip open the bellies of two of his vassals that he might foment his feet in their warm bowels by way of refreshment.

To enumerate all the evils that existed under the old government, would be to write the history of the Revolution. It is here only intended to give a short sketch of the prominent

the walls of their cells ; many of which, being below the level of the water, are in a constant state of humidity ; and a noxious vapour issued from them, which more than once extinguished the candle, and was so insufferable, that it required a strong spirit of curiosity to tempt one to enter. Good God !---and to these regions of horror were human creatures dragged at the caprice of despotic power ! What a melancholy consideration, that

---

“ Man ! proud man,  
Drest in a little brief authority,  
Plays such fantastic tricks before high heav’n,  
As make the angels weep.”

“ There appears to be a greater number of these dungeons than one could have imagined the hard heart of tyranny itself could contrive ; for, since the destruction of the building, many subterraneous cells have been discovered underneath a piece of ground which was inclosed within the walls of the Bastille, but which seemed a bank of solid earth before the horrid secrets of this prison-house were disclosed. Some skeletons were found in these recesses, with irons still fastened on their decaying bones.

“ Those who have contemplated the dungeons of the Bastille, without rejoicing in the French Revolution, may, for aught I know, be very respectable persons, and very agreeable companions in the hours of prosperity ; but if my heart were sinking with anguish, I should not fly to those persons for consolation.”



minent features of despotism, which operated to produce that memorable event. It is sufficient to mention a few other grievances, of a different nature, which the people endured from the undue exertions of arbitrary power. Grants, of a peculiar nature, injurious to agriculture, and distressing to the farmers, were in certain districts, made by the King to the Princes of the Blood.---By one, they were put in possession of the property of all game, which term includes whole droves of wild boars, and herds of deer, not confined by wall or pale, but wandering at pleasure, over the whole country, to the destruction of crops, and to the peopling of the gallies, by the wretched peasants, who presumed to kill them, in order to save that food which was to support their helpless children. For preserving the game, there were numerous edicts, which prohibited weeding and hoeing, lest the young partridges should be disturbed;---steeping seed, lest it should injure the game;---manuring with night-soil, lest the flavour of the partridges should be injured, by feeding on the corn so produced;---mowing hay, &c. before a certain time, so late as to spoil many crops, and taking away the stubble, which would deprive the birds of shelter.

While the industry of the honest labourer was thus weighed down on the one hand, by the heavy influence of Feudal tyranny, his scanty earnings were, by the exorbitant claims of the Farmers-General, extorted from him on the other. These were a set of men, that were, in fact, *licensed* by the government



government to *oppress* the people, and the hardships which the poorer classes, in particular, suffered from them, were intolerable.-- The science of farming taxes (says Rabaut) consists in giving as little as you can to the state, in order to lay as much as you can upon the people.---The office of Farmer General was held by opulent and avaricious men, whose only object was, the augmentation of their fortunes, and who, without scruple or conscience, fleeced the people most unmercifully.

To supply the unbounded extravagances of the court, was also sold, the exclusive right of exercising such and such professions, and that right became a title. Patents were made out for carrying on the trade of a peruke-maker, a coal-meter, and of a searcher of hog's tongues; and these callings became exclusive---they were termed privileges. The rich purchased them as a speculation, and sold them to advantage:---this low kind of speculation, changed the character of a people, where every thing, even to honour, was become venal. These new created offices were all so many indirect taxes, for the purchaser never failed to make the public reimburse him:---It was injurious to industry, since, in order to exercise a profession, it was not necessary to have talents for it, but to be either rich already, or to borrow, in order to become rich. In fine, it was an additional burden to the State, which paid the salary or the interest of every office that was sold. The number of these offices have been estimated at above 300,000; and it has been  
I calculated,



calculated, that in the space of two centuries, the people had been burthened with more than one hundred millions of new taxes, solely for the purpose of paying the interest of them. By the long duration, and accumulation of these abuses, there was formed in the heart of the nation, a second nation, particular and privileged; it was a confederacy of all those whose life and existence depended upon the abuses. This new nation lived at the expence of the old one, and a peaceful administration of fifty years, without wars, and without wants, would have proved insufficient for the reformation of these enormities. In fact, what an astonishing combination would a Minister, nay, a Monarch, have had to combat? Sixty thousand Nobles, possessed of all the connections of the Feudal System, and that host of dependents which was fed by them;--a hundred thousand privileged persons, all leagued to support their prerogative of not paying such or such an impost;---two hundred thousand priests, very unequal, indeed, as to income, but all united in one common system, forming but one whole, directing at their pleasure, the women and the rabble, and accustomed, for a thousand years, to govern the Empire, by opinion and by prejudices;---and that numerous groupe of Revenue Agents, Farmers General, and that multitude of persons in office, who all fattened on the miseries of the people and grew rich in proportion as they grew poor:---the consideration of these abuses might be sufficient to

convince,



convince, even those, of the necessity \* of a Revolution, who talked only of a gentle Reformation. Vile and interested men had seized

\* It will be hardly necessary to observe, to the candid reader, that there is an essential difference between the approbation of the French Revolution, and that of the massacres which followed; though the friends of the one have been unjustly represented as the favourers of the other. Is it necessary that a friend to the English Revolution should also approve of the massacre of Glencoe? Or is this massacre derived from, or connected with, the English Revolution principles? The same distinction may be made in the two cases of the French Revolution on the one hand, and the enormities of Marat and Robespierre on the other. Their crimes do not disprove the French Revolution principles.

In the great struggles for national freedom, it frequently, and unfortunately happens, that many good and innocent men are sacrificed to the ambition, or malevolence of a few. General convulsions create jealousy and suspicion, and afford the malicious and the wicked, an opportunity to gratify their private pique and resentment, which they commonly effect under the pretence of promoting the public good. This has been done by Robespierre and his accomplices in France, and by Breadalbane and his accomplices in Scotland. The following quotation from Dr. Smollett's History of England, contains the particulars of the massacre of Glencoe. "King William had by proclamation offered an indemnity to all those who had been in arms against him, provided they would submit, and take the oaths by a certain day; and this was prolonged to the close of the present year, [1691] with a denunciation of military execution against those who should hold out after the end of December. Macdonald, [the chieftain of Glencoe, who had opposed the government of William] intimidated by this declaration, repaired on the very last day of the month to Fort William, and desired that the oaths might be tendered to him by Colonel Hill, governor of that fortress. As this officer was not vested with the power of a civil magistrate he refused to administer them; and Macdonald set out immediately for Inverary, the county town of Argyle. Though the ground was covered with snow, and the weather intensely cold, he travelled with such diligence, that the term prescribed by the proclamation was but one day elapsed when he reached the place, and addressed himself to Sir John Campbell, sheriff of the county, who, in consideration of his disappointment at Fort William, was prevailed upon to administer the oaths to him and his adherents. Then they returned to their own habitations in the valley of Glencoe, in full confidence of being protected by the government, to which he had so solemnly submitted.

Lord Breadalbane [between whom and Macdonald there existed a private pique, arising from an ancient and hereditary feud]



seized upon the vitals of the nation, and nothing could disengage their devouring fangs, but the entire destruction of that power by which

feud] had represented Macdonald at court as an incorrigible rebel, as a ruffian inured to bloodshed and rapine, who would never be obedient to the laws of his country, nor live peaceably under any sovereign. He observed, that he had paid no regard to the proclamation, and proposed that the government should sacrifice him to the quiet of the kingdom, in extirpating him, with his family and dependents, by military execution. His advice was supported by the suggestions of the other Scottish ministers; and the king, whose chief virtue was not humanity, signed a warrant for the destruction of those unhappy people, though it does not appear that he knew of Macdonald's submission. An order for this barbarous execution, signed and countersigned by his majesty's own hand, being transmitted to the master of Stair, secretary for Scotland, this minister sent particular directions to Livingstone, who commanded the troops in that kingdom, to put the inhabitants of Glencoe to the sword, charging him to take no prisoners, that the scene might be more terrible. In the month of February, Captain Campbell, of Glenlyon, by virtue of an order from Major Duncanson, marched into the valley of Glencoe, with a company of soldiers belonging to Argyle's regiment, on pretence of levying the arrears of the land-tax and hearth-money. When Macdonald demanded whether they came as friends or enemies; he answered, as friends; and promised, upon his honour, that neither he nor his people should sustain the least injury. In consequence of this declaration he and his men were received with the most cordial hospitality, and lived fifteen days with the men of the valley, in all the appearance of the most unreserved friendship. At length the fatal period approached. Macdonald and Campbell, having passed the day together, parted about seven in the evening, with mutual professions of the warmest affection. The younger Macdonald perceiving the guards doubled, began to suspect some treachery, and communicated his suspicion to his brother; but neither he nor the Father would harbour the least doubt of Campbell's sincerity: nevertheless, the two young men went forth privately to make further observations. They overheard the common soldiers say they liked not the work; that though they would have willingly fought the Macdonalds of the Glen, fairly in the field, they held it base to murder them in cool blood, but that their officers were answerable for the treachery. When the youths hastened back to apprise their father of the impending danger, they saw the house already surrounded: they heard the discharge of muskets, the shrieks of women and children; and, being destitute of arms, secured their own lives by immediate flight. The savage ministers of vengeance



which they held their prey. After the Revolution was effected, the reformation of the finances was one object to which the National Assembly directed their attention. A Committee was appointed, for the purpose of inquiring into the expenditure of the public money, in pensions and donations; and, if any thing has appeared to the reader, in the course of this brief detail, to induce him to think a Revolution in France necessary, the frauds and iniquities that were discovered to have been practised by the court, will confirm his approbation of that event. It was found that a register was kept by the Minister, under the name of the *Red Book*,

vengeance had entered the old man's chamber, and shot him through the head. He fell dead in the arms of his wife, who died next day, distracted by the horror of her husband's fate. --- The laird of Auchintrincken, Macdonald's guest, who had three months before this period submitted to the government, and at this very time had a protection in his pocket, was put to death without question. A boy of eight years, who fell at Campbell's feet, imploring mercy, and offering to serve him for life, was stabbed to the heart by one Drummond, a subaltern officer. — Eight and thirty persons suffered in this manner, the greater part of whom were surprised in their beds, and hurried into eternity before they had time to implore the divine mercy. The design was to butcher all the males under seventy, that lived in the valley, the number of whom amounted to two hundred; some of the detachments did not arrive soon enough to secure the passes; so that one hundred and sixty escaped. Campbell, having perpetrated this brutal massacre, ordered all the houses to be burned, made a prey of all the cattle and effects that were found in the valley, and left the helpless women and children, whose fathers and husbands he had murdered, naked and forlorn, without covering, food, or shelter, in the midst of the snow that covered the whole face of the country, at the distance of six long miles from any inhabited place. Distracted with grief and horror, surrounded with the shades of night, shivering with cold, and appalled with the apprehension of immediate death from the swords of those who had sacrificed their friends and kinsmen, they could not endure such a complication of calamities, but generally perished in the waste, before they could receive the least comfort or assistance."



in which every pension, or gift, was entered, in the hand-writing of the Comptroller-General of the Finances, and checked by the King himself. The publication of the *Red Book*, by the Committee, disclosed a series of extravagance and iniquity, perhaps unparalleled. Such was the profusion of one Minister alone, (M. Calonne) that under his short administration, it appeared, that, independent of their immense Revenues, the two brothers of the King had committed depredations on the public treasury, to the amount of nearly *two millions sterling*; that upwards of *one million one hundred thousand* of this, had fallen to the share of the Count d'Artois, and that the same Minister had undertaken, moreover, to discharge the debts of this Prince, amounting to nearly *one million* besides. It was also found, that the public money had been lavished upon prostituted women.--- Among the donations and benefactions was recorded a present of 600,000*l.* to an individual, for his *important services*; and these services, so important to the State, were, that he stayed *contentedly* at home, while his wife, (Madame Polignac) was employed in *secret services* at the court.

When the despotism, which had oppressed the French people for ages, was destroyed, they began the work of forming a Constitution, to secure their rights as men and citizens of a free nation. But it has ever been the case, that the minds of despotic Sovereigns become alarmed in proportion to the increase of liberty and happiness of the people. After the change of government in France, the neighbouring



neighbouring Princes grew jealous of the French liberty, and in order to destroy it, a Convention was held at Pilnitz, in Saxony, in the Summer of 1791, between the Emperor Leopold, and the King of Prussia; between whom, as principals, a treaty was formed, the object of which was, the hostile invasion of France, and the new-modelling of its government.---In the league of Pilnitz the Empress of Russia was principally concerned, and the partition of France, as well as Poland, it is said, was included in the projects of the Confederated Powers. The object of the Convention of Pilnitz was only imperfectly understood in France till some time after; and during the moment the Royal banditti were plotting against her peace and her liberty, she was in a state of internal tranquillity, and in all probability would have continued so, and Louis XVI. still have been living, but for the duplicity of Foreign Powers, whose conduct was formed to raise in the minds of the French people an indignation against their Sovereign. This, however, may be said, at least, that the language used by the Emperor and the King of Prussia, in their proclamation, which was, "*that the King was not sincere in accepting the Constitution,*" powerfully operated to the downfall of the unfortunate Monarch; and whether true or not, it was calculated to have the worst effect upon the populace of Paris, and may be justly assigned as the principal cause of the outrages against his person, on the 10th of August, when his deposition took place.

What contributed much to raise the apprehensions of the French, of the hostile intention



ion of Foreign Powers, was the encouragement which they gave to the Emigrant Princes, who had left their country, for the purpose of levying war against the newly-erected Government. Combinations of armed Emigrants assembled on the frontiers; preparations for war were carried on in the territories of the Emperor, with vigour and alacrity; the league of Pilnitz existed in its full force, and France was menaced with a hostile invasion. In consequence of these warlike appearances, application was made by the King to the Emperor, to prevent the armed combination of Emigrants in the German territories. The Emperor promised to pay proper attention to this requisition, and gave the most lavish assurance of his friendship for Louis and the National Assembly; but, at the same time, such was his duplicity, he was secretly encouraging the Emigrants, and actually studying excuses for commencing a war.

The conduct of Leopold was a singular tissue of inconsistency and deception.---The reply from him, as well as from the King of Prussia, to the general notification from the French King, of his having accepted the Constitution, was couched in terms of apparent approbation; but, at the very time when he was professing such amicable intentions to France, he was also exhorting the Powers of Europe not to desist from the measures concerted between them, but to declare, that their coalition had still an existence:---This declaration was immediately followed by a letter to Louis himself, reviving the  
claims



claims of the Imperial vassals in Alsace and Lorraine; insisting that no compensation could be accepted, but that matters should be restored to the same situation as they were in under the old Government. Though, such were the pretences of Leopold, it appeared in fact, that the German Princes in general, were more than satisfied with the compensation which the French offered them, in lieu of their feudal revenues, abolished after the Revolution, but the Emperor solemnly declared, in his letter to Louis, that he conceived himself not only bound to interpose, by solemn protestation, “ but also to give to the injured *all the aid* which the dignity of the Imperial Court, and the maintenance of the present Constitution, required.” The intentions of the Emperor were no longer doubtful---his disposition to war was evident, in consequence of which, the French deemed it prudent to make vigorous preparations for defending themselves against external enemies.

In the course of these proceedings, the Emperor died suddenly, on the first of March, 1792, an event which, it was supposed, would operate in favour of peace; but in this the French were greatly mistaken, for Francis I. the young King of Hungary, was no sooner seated on the Imperial Throne, than he openly avowed the concert of Princes against the constitution of France, and declared his intention of strictly and literally adhering to the Convention of Pilnitz. The dispatches that were about this time received from the court of Vienna, in answer to the requisition made by the French Minister, amounted, virtually, to

L . . . a declaration



a declaration of war.---They began with stating, that the King of Hungary had fully adopted the political system of the late Emperor, and would explain himself with that frankness which became a great power :---the paper concluded with observing, that the sound and principal part of the nation (or in other words, the aristocratic faction) “ *would consider, as a consoling prospect, the existence of a concert, the views of which were worthy of their confidence.*”

As the court of Vienna seemed determined upon war, Louis was advised by his Ministers, to send a letter in his *own hand writing*, to his Nephew, the Emperor, in which he intreated him, by every motive, to stop the effusion of blood, and assured him, “ *that the conflict would only prove ultimately fatal to himself*” --- [Louis.] With so little success, however, was this application attended, that the reply of the Imperial Minister seemed only to breathe an increased spirit of insolence and pride. He insisted upon certain terms, upon which alone the Emperor and the King of Prussia could with-hold from hostilities. Among other singular terms which the Combined Courts demanded, as conditions of peace, was one of a most extraordinary nature :---It was indefinite, and might be modified according to the pleasure or caprice of the demandants. It was, “ that the neighbouring powers should have no reason for the apprehensions which might arise from the present weakness of the internal government of France.” The effect may easily be imagined, which this ambiguous language would have upon the National Assembly,



sembly, who were tremblingly alive to every thing that seemed to affect their newly-recovered liberties. The King, insulted by the menacing replies of Foreign Courts, made a proposal to the Assembly for a declaration of war against the King of Hungary and Bohemia, on the 20th of April, 1792, when war was decreed amidst the whole Legislative Body, and a numerous crowd of spectators.

Little progress had been made in the war, when another power appeared in arms against the French Nation. On the 6th of July, Louis announced to the Assembly, that the King of Prussia, who had long indicated hostile intentions, was marching with 52,000 men, to co-operate with the King of Hungary.

On the 16th of September following, the National Assembly declared war against the King of Sardinia. They grounded their declaration upon the following reasons :--- That the King of Sardinia had been among the first to encourage and assist the Emigrants; that he had acceded to the treaty of Pilnitz; that he had arrested the French Ambassador on the Frontiers, on pretences, allowed afterwards to be groundless; that he had increased his armaments in Savoy, and filled the fortresses of Montmedian with troops; and, that after the affair of the 10th of August, he had held a Congress of Foreign Ministers, to deliberate upon a plan for invading France.

It was not till the beginning of the year 1793, when the British Court entered into the general combination against the liberties of France. The grounds upon which they pleaded the *justice and necessity* of engaging in



in the war on the Continent, were, that the French had, in November, formed a design to open the Scheldt, the exclusive navigation of which belonged to our ally, the Dutch; and passed a decree on the 19th of the same month, which tended to excite sedition in all nations. In respect to the first ground, it must be observed, that the treaty, by which the house of Austria had formerly surrendered to the Dutch the exclusive navigation of the Scheldt, was concluded without the participation of the Belgians, through whose territories that river flows; that when the French took possession of the Belgic provinces in 1792, the people then no longer acknowledged the authority of the Emperor, and the Scheldt was opened at the request of the inhabitants, to whom alone it was considered as of importance; that the Dutch themselves were indifferent as to the navigation of the Scheldt, and did not think it a sufficient cause of war, and if they did not, why should the English ministry, whose interference was never requested?---But, without any further debate upon the subject, it is impossible to believe the ministry to be sincere when they profess to consider the opening of the Scheldt, a *real* ground for hostility, when it is known, that in the year 1786, the Emperor Joseph, had conceived a similar project, and that the English Ambassador, Sir Joseph Yorke, was sent to Antwerp, for the *express purpose* of instigating the inhabitants of that city, to petition the Emperor to insist upon the free navigation of that river; for, what seemed so very reasonable

in



in 1786, could not be considered as a just cause of involving the nation in the calamities of war in 1793.

The decree of the 19th of November, so obnoxious to the English ministry, originated in a circumstance which happened in the bailliwick of Darmstadt, in the territories of the Duke of Deux Ponts, at that period at war with the French nation. The people, headed by the magistrates and the principal inhabitants of the districts, had declared their wishes to be united to France, and solicited her protection against their former master. In consequence of this, the National Convention passed a decree, "That they would grant fraternity and assistance to all those people who wished to procure Liberty." Though this resolution was impolitic and absurd, yet it could not be brought forward, by the British Court, as a just cause of hostility. The Convention had not manifested a design of invading the territories of Great Britain, and the explanation of the decree, by the Executive Council, would have been satisfactory to men, who were not pre-determined to plunge the nation into a war, at any rate. They totally disclaimed the meaning which the British ministry were pleased to put upon it, and declared it applicable only to a case, in which the general will of a nation, *clearly and unequivocally* expressed, should call for their assistance." When the English ministry charged the French with hostile intentions, and they not only disclaimed such intentions, but at the same time, professed a wish to be in terms of amity and friendship with Great Britain, and the mi-



nistry not only refused to hear such professions, but carried forward hostile preparations, it must appear that they had some other motive of war than the decree in question. In whatever light the English ministry might pretend to consider this decree, it seems, that to them only it was obnoxious; had it been so calculated to excite sedition and rebellion, as they appeared to apprehend, America, Denmark, and Sweden, as well as England, must have been affected by it; but these powers never made it a plea to engage in a war with France, or conceived it as tending to endanger their liberties, and they still continue to enjoy the blessings of peace, and their establishments unhurt by the spirit of fraternization.

Those who charge the French as the aggressors, upon the principle, that they were the first to declare war, look only to the effect, and not to the cause. That power is the aggressor which first violates existing treaties, and endeavours, by menaces and insults, to provoke its adversary to hostilities, and war is *generally* declared in consequence of the injuries received, or the rights invaded, by that power on which the act of aggression was committed, and not by that which committed it; and, if we advert to circumstances, previously to the present calamitous contest, it will be found, that means more successful could not possibly have been devised, to outrage the feelings of the French, and to reduce them to the necessity of declaring war against Great Britain, than the language employed by the agents of the English Government,



ment, and the measures of the ministers themselves.

The memorial presented to the States General, on the 25th of January, 1793, by Lord Auckland, the English Ambassador at the Hague, is alone, sufficient to shew whether the British Government was more desirous to avoid, or to provoke, a war. His Lordship describes the Legislature of France, as "Wretches, assuming the title of philosophers, who had the presumption to think themselves capable of establishing a new system of civil society, and to realise a dream of vanity."---who "destroyed all received notions of subordination, manners, and religion." They were further charged with "Imbecility and villany"---"Property, liberty, security, even life itself," were said, "to be playthings in the hands of these infamous men---the slaves of the most licentious passions, of rapine, enmity, and ambition."

The measures of the English Government at home, afforded the French still stronger grounds of complaint. The exportation of corn to France was prohibited in December, (contrary to the Commercial Treaty of 1786) when it was permitted to all other countries. The passing of the Alien Bill, was another violation of the same treaty; by which it was also declared, that, in case of a misunderstanding arising between the two nations, if either nation dismissed the Ambassador of the other, such dismissal should be deemed a rupture; yet on the 24th of January, Chauvelin, the French Ambassador in London, received an order to quit the kingdom within  
eight



eight days ; and, to magnify the affront, the order was, by authority, inserted in the London Gazette. Here was the rupture ; the hostile intention of England was no longer doubtful. By the dismissal of Chauvelin, and the operation of the Alien Bill, the French were deprived of the means of a fair and open negociation, and were provoked, by the insults and aggressions of the English Government, to a declaration of war. The declaration was made, on the motion of Brissot, on the 1st of February, 1793, against England and the Stadtholder of the United Provinces \*. But, if no such declaration had been made on the part of France, it is scarcely possible to imagine that it was the intention of the British Court to withhold from hostilities, when it is known, that the Minis-

\* On the 14th of July, 1793, a treaty was concluded between his Britannic Majesty and the King of Prussia, by which, “ *they reciprocally promised not to lay down their arms but by common consent.*” - On the 13th of March 1794, the King of Prussia published a declaration, announcing his secession from the confederacy. He declared his inability to continue the war, for the great purpose of restoring Monarchy in France, unless he was subsidized by *somebody*. The wants and the wishes of his Prussian Majesty were no sooner made known to the English Ministers, than they immediately repaired to his relief ; and on the 19th of the following month, a treaty was signed at the Hague, by which it was agreed, that Great Britain should pay his Prussian Majesty a subsidy of 1,200,000*l.* for the use of his troops ; but on the 10th of April, 1795, *after he had received the money*, he, like “ *a good and faithful ally,*” who had promised “ *not to lay down his arms but by common consent,*” withdrew from the confederacy in earnest, and concluded a separate peace with the French Republic.

On the 15th of May, 1795, the Dutch, the *protection* of whose dominions was the *first* plea offered by the British Ministers for engaging in the war, concluded a treaty, *offensive and defensive*, with the French. In consequence, we are at this moment in a state of warfare with that very power, the protection of which was made a plea for engaging in the contest with France.



ter himself, acknowledged, on the 17th of June, “ *that if the French had not declared war against us, we must have done so against them.*”

And Mr. Burke, who it is believed, was in the confidence of ministers, on the 15th of December, preceding the French declaration, declared the war “ *not to be a measure now in debate, but decided; for that we were actually at war with the French already.*”

When Mr. Burke thus prematurely exposed the designs of the ministry, he, in all probability, had in his mind the treaty of Pilnitz, the object of which was plainly nothing less than the partition of France, and to which it has been asserted, that the British Court acceded, in March, 1792; and, when it is recollected, that Toulon was taken by Lord Hood, in trust for *Louis XVII.*---Valenciennes, in the name of the *Emperor*,---and Dunkirk summoned to surrender, in the name of his *Britannic Majesty*, it may appear to some, that the assertion is not wholly without foundation.

The French may justly be charged with a precipitancy in their declarations of war, arising, in some measure, from the irascible minds which too much actuated their councils; but, at the same time, it is but justice to acknowledge, on their part, that they were desirous to avoid a war with this country. After they had engaged in hostilities with the Emperor and the King of Prussia, they professed a wish to maintain a good understanding with the King of Great Britain.---Their common cry was, “ Peace with England, and we challenge the whole Continent

N

of

of Europe.” And, even after hostilities had been actually commenced, a most liberal and humane proposal was made to Lord Grenville, by the French ministry, for putting an end to the calamities of war, by amicable negotiation. The proposal was brought over by Mr John Salter, an English gentleman, who delivered it to Lord Grenville, of which the following is an authentic copy :

“ MY LORD,

“ The French Republic being desirous to terminate all its differences with Great Britain, and to end a war, which, by the manner it is otherwise likely to rage, cannot fail to bring miseries dreadful to humanity, on both nations; I have the honour to demand of you Lordship, as minister of his Britannic Majesty, a pass-port and safe conduct for a person possessed with full powers to repair to London, for that purpose. Mr. John Salter, Notary Public, in London, will deliver this to your Lordship, and on the condition of its being requisite, another letter, containing the name of a person who will have the confidence of the nation.

(signed)

*Paris, April 2, 1793.*

“ LE BRUN.”

Why no notice was taken of this application, it remains for the minister to explain.

The next power brought into the contest against the French nation was Spain. When the fate of Louis was pending in the Convention, his Catholic Majesty made a liberal application in favour of that unfortunate Monarch, but the arrogant and contemptuous manner in which that application was treated, might dispose the King of Spain to hostilities; and, being pressed by the Combined Powers to unite in the common cause, there is little doubt but that he was resolved upon war; the Convention, however, with their usual precipitancy, determined to anticipate his declaration,



claration, and on the 7th of March passed a decree of war against his Catholic Majesty.\*

To the Confederated Powers enumerated, may be added the Landgrave of Hesse, the Elector of Hanover, the Margrave of Baden, &c. &c. &c. The motives of these Princes for joining the contest are easily understood. To them, (*the Elector of Hanover excepted*) the war was a market, at which they sold their subjects to advantage.---They agreed with the English Ministry, at the *expence* of the *English nation*, to furnish the Combined Powers with so many men, at so much per head; but, when it is considered with what reluctance these purchased *heroes* fought, it must be acknowledged, that they were a worse bargain to this country than the Prussian troops, which Mr. Pitt calculated to cost upwards of 20l. per man.

\* On the 25th of May, 1793, a treaty was concluded, between his Britannic Majesty and the King of Spain, by which they "*promised and engaged to act in perfect concert, and in the most intimate confidence, and reciprocally promised not to lay down their arms, unless it should be by mutual consent.*" But on the 22d of July, 1795, his Catholic Majesty followed the example of his Prussian Majesty, and concluded a separate peace with the French Republic.

On the 25th of March, preceding, a treaty was concluded, between his Britannic Majesty and the Empress of Russia, by which, "*they engaged to employ their respective forces, in carrying on the just and necessary war against France and reciprocally promised not to lay down their arms but by common consent.*" Of the conduct of the King of Prussia, the King of Spain, and the Empress of Russia, as the *allies* of England, there seems only to be this difference,-- that, the two first have *broken* the contract with Great Britain, and the last has not *fulfilled* it.

The Emperor, in consideration of the millions he has received from England, continues his support.---How long his assistance will be given may depend, in some measure, upon the strength of the English treasury.

Having



Having briefly unfolded the motives which led to the powerful confederacy against France, it may not be uninteresting to recapitulate the various objects of the war, which the different powers have professed to have in view. On turning our attention to the conduct of the Allies, and examining their manifestoes and declarations, which have appeared since the commencement of hostilities, we shall find that prevarication and duplicity, have been the distinguishing features of their proceedings, and that their *professed* objects have been as inconsistent, as their *real* ones have been detestable.

When a nation enters into a war, it is necessary that its object be clearly and accurately defined, that the people may know, with precision, for what end their exertions are required. Prevarication and duplicity, eventually, injure that cause they are intended to support. When the Ministers of a Government delude the people into a calamitous war, by holding out false objects, and spend, with unlimited profusion, their blood and treasure, in a contest not founded on the evident principles of justice and necessity, but originating in sordid motives of interest and ambition, they not only deserve the severest punishment of their country, but should be held up as objects of the contempt and execration of posterity.

It is a curious fact, that the Emperor and the King of Prussia, who professedly made war upon the Constitution of 1791, should, a few months after they had engaged in the war---after they had wantonly disturbed the peace of France, and done irreparable injury  
to



to their own subjects, desire only *as their ultimate object, the re-establishment of that Constitution.* And it is no less curious than inconsistent, that the Duke of Brunswick, after having published his manifesto, dated July 25, 1792, in which he threatened, and presumptuously engaged, to march to Paris, to cut off the heads of *all* the Members of the National Assembly, and to re-instate the King in the full exercise of his former power, should, in the month of September following, disclaim all idea of interfering in the internal Government of France; that he should intreat only for the personal safety of the King; that, with his own lips, he should request as a favor, *that any place whatever, might be assigned him, in the new order of things,* and that he should say to Dumourier, “Make him your King, under the strictest limits; make him a Stadtholder; make him the principal *Tax Gatherer* of the country; give him only a place, and that is all we ask, and then we shall have some pretext for retiring.”

In a few months were issued six different proclamations; one holding out a different object from another. The proclamation of Lord Hood, after the taking of Toulon, promised to restore to the French the Constitution of 1789; but this not being agreeable to the views of Austria, it was followed by another, from General Wurmser, which had, for its object, the old despotism of France, previously to the destruction of the Bastille. The Prince of Saxe Cobourg, in his first manifesto, disclaimed the idea of conquest, and professed his intention to establish in

France a limited Monarchy, but four days after it had been issued, he published a second, in which he recanted his first, declaring, “that, the form of Government which it had in view, could not be restored, consistently with the tranquillity of Europe.”

The conduct of the British Court affords no less room for animadversion. In statesmen, inconsistency and deception, are crimes of the first magnitude; and, when they unite in a Prime Minister, they are attended with consequences to the community, the evils of which, are incalculable.

On the 12th of February, 1793, the minister declared, “That the *whole* of the interference of Great Britain was, to check the French system of aggrandisement and aggression, with a view to re-establish the blessings of peace, and *not to dictate any form of Government to that country.*” And upon this principle, a large majority supported him in Parliament, and the supplies were voted to prosecute the contest; but, when he had succeeded thus far in his views, he declared, “That there never was a word uttered by him or his colleagues, that bound up the country from availing itself of *any means* to use every interference in the internal state of France, that could *tend to produce the return of peace,*” and, that the tranquillity of Europe could only be permanently secured, by making the Crown of France hereditary, in the person of Louis XVII :---And his Majesty, in his proclamation of the 29th of October, “promised his friendship and protection, to  
all



all the French people who would declare for a *Monarchical Government*."

The Minister also assured the Parliament, that "England entered into the war as an *auxiliary*;" but, it soon after appeared, that she was engaged in it as a *principal*, and engaged to pay the *principal share of the expence*. The striking inconsistency of this, with his former declarations, and the change, both of the *object* and *system* of the war, filled with astonishment the minds of several of his adherents, and a number of independent Members, who had originally voted with the Minister, declared, that he had deceived them; and accordingly withdrew their support, and joined the opposition. On this occasion, *Mr. Curwen* spoke as follows:---"I admit that I promised to give my unequivocal support to the war, but as its object is no longer what it was first stated to be, I claim a right of retraction, and declare, that I shall oppose the continuance of the war, upon the principles, and for the object now avowed, in every way which is in my power; and, I am fully convinced, that if the country had known at first, that such were the principles upon which we were to fight, that they would never have engaged in so disgraceful a contest."

It is a melancholy reflection, that every war, in which this country has been engaged for several years past, has been more expensive than that which preceded it. Every war minister seems to have regularly improved upon the extravagance of his predecessor. The war, begun in 1756, cost, on an

an average, nearly 16,000,000l. a year ; the American war, nearly 20,000,000l. a year ; the present contest with France has been prosecuted upon a system, far more ruinous and expensive. It cannot be reckoned, on an average, since its commencement, to the present year (1796) at less than 28,000,000l. a year \*. Millions have been paid to allies on the continent, with a profusion unparalleled in any former war. Foreign powers have been liberally subsidized to protect their own dominions, and to fight their own battles.---The British coffers have been subservient to every Prince that would join in the contest for money : nay, every State that could be either *bribed* or *bullied* into the war, has appeared in the list of the confederacy.---The treasure of England, and the strength of Europe,

\* Debt incurred by the present War, from the Year 1793 to 1796 inclusive.

	Principal. £.	An Interest. £.
Stock in the 3 <i>per cents.</i> in 1793	6,250,000	187,500
Ditto — in 1794	11,000,000	330,000
Ditto in Feb. 1795	18,000,000	540,000
Ditto in Dec. 1795	26,100,000	783,000
Stock in the 4 <i>per cents.</i> in 1794	2,750,000	110,000
Ditto in Feb. 1795	6,000,000	240,000
Navy debt funded in the 5 <i>per cents.</i> in 1794	1,949,330	97,466
Ditto ditto in 1795	2,012,040	100,602
An annuity of 62,792l. for 66 years in 1794		62,792
Ditto of 85,500l. for 65 do. Feb. 1795		85,500
Ditto of 58,500l. for 64 do. Dec. 1795		58,500
Whole ann. 206,792l. worth, at 4l. 13s. 6d. <i>per cent.</i>	4,288,900	
<i>Funded</i> debt and its interest, exclusive of management - - - - -	78,350,270	2,595,360
		Unfunded



rope, have been united against the republicans of France; and, after every exertion, every experiment, and every expence, the object of the war, or, to establish a monarchical government, is further off than ever; and yet the Minister seems obstinately determined to persevere in hostilities, till the *French* shew a disposition to peace, on grounds, just and honourable to this country, and *then*, he has declared himself willing to meet negotiation. But is it consistent with the nature or

Unfunded Debt.      Principal.      An. Interest.

	£.	£.
Navy debt	5,000,000	
Vote of credit for the extraordinaries of the army and navy	4,000,000	
A debt not paid by the East India Company, but taken as part of the supplies in 1794 and 1795	1,000,000	
Exchequer bills	6,000,000	
	<hr/>	
Unfunded debt and interest at 3 <i>per cent.</i>	16,000,000	800,000
Funded debt and int <sup>e</sup> est	78,350,270	2,595,360
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total of the debt and the annual expence attending exclusive of management	94,350,270	3,395,360
To which may be added the Emperor's loan consisting of stock in the 3 <i>per cents.</i>	3,833,333	
Ann. of 230,000 <i>l.</i> worth	3,320,441	
	<hr/>	
	7,153,774	345,000
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	101,504,044	3,740,360

This statement is given by Mr. Morgan [in his late important pamphlet, entitled, "Facts, addressed to the serious attention of the people of Great Britain,"] on the supposition, that the supplies for the present year were provided for by the loan in December last; but, the last month [April] having produced *another Budget*, the loan of 7,500,000*l.* for which contracts are now making, added to the above, makes the principal of the debt incurred, in four years, 109,004,044. If to this, be added, the sums that will be wanted for different purposes, before the expiration of the present year, the amount will be several millions more.



things, to suppose, that a people, with victory on their side, who have conquered whole provinces \* from their enemies, will be inclined to come forward with terms of pacification to those very men, who have employed every epithet of abuse, to outrage their feelings, and to insult their understandings? It is hardly to be expected that the French will shew themselves readily disposed to negotiate with the *present* Minister, and, as he has taken effectual means to secure his situation, we have little else in prospect than a

\* Since the commencement of the war, the French have made a conquest of

The ten provinces of Brabant, Antwerp, Mechlin, Limburg, Luxembourg, Namur, Hainault, Artois, Cambressis and Flanders, forming the Austrian Netherlands, and formerly subject to the Emperor of Germany---

The seven United Provinces of Holland, Zealand, Friesland, Groningen, Overijssel, Gelderland, and Utrecht, forming the Dutch nation, and formerly subject to the Stadtholder, and several Principalities, Bishoprics, Duchies, and Electorates, &c. on the South of the Rhine, formerly subject to different princes, sovereign Bishops, &c. the whole of which are calculated to contain a population of upwards of *ten Millions*!

To their conquests on the Land, may be added their achievements on the Sea. By Lloyd's List it appears, that, the Ships taken by the French, from England, and the other powers at war, from January 1793, to December 1795, amount to 2000

Re-taken by our Cruisers, 119

---

1881

Taken by England and the other powers at war, from France, 319

---

Balance in favor of France, 1562

To this catalogue of French successes, it would be a difficult matter to reconcile the *ever memorable* speech of Mr. Jenkinson, in the House of Commons, on the 10th of March, in which "he insisted that the navy of this country never appeared more glorious with respect to its achievements, and that there never was a more glorious and successful war; and that, he was ready to meet the honourable Gentleman (Mr. Grey) upon any of these grounds, in

PROOF OF HIS ASSERTION."

continuance



continuance of the same destructive system---  
*war* and *taxation*. If this system be continued, the evils which it will inevitably produce must be deprecated by every true lover of his country. Every addition to the national debt, is an advancement to national ruin.---  
 The resources of a nation, like those of an individual, must, by a continued system of extravagance, be eventually exhausted.---  
 There is a time when the prodigality of a government, like that of a spendthrift, must be *compelled* to stop: but the consequence cannot be contemplated without horror. The effects which unnecessary wars, and oppressive taxes, have produced, in France, one would think, might have warned the Minister of the danger of pursuing a similar plan in this country; for similar causes produce similar effects. The only consolation to those who wish to prevent the horrors of confusion is, in the change of sentiment that is rapidly taking place in the minds of the people, who, it is to be hoped, will, ere long, speak with *one voice*, against the continuance of a war, pregnant with evils of the most alarming nature. If the termination of hostilities depends upon a majority in Parliament, when will the period of tranquillity arrive? When may the people of England expect again to enjoy the blessings of peace and prosperity? There is no measure of the Minister but what is sure of a full support in Parliament. It is a fact, as lamentable as it is true, that Lord North, who began and conducted the ruinous war with America, had a majority on his side, the *very last day* on which he appeared in the House



House as Minister of the Crown, when he was driven to the humiliating necessity of resigning, not for want of *support in Parliament*, but by the unanimous voice of an indignant, and much injured people. And if we advert to circumstances, during the present administration, and particularly to the preparations for war with Russia, it will appear, that the Minister had a majority in the House, for proceeding to hostilities, when the sense of the nation was evidently against him; that this consideration only induced him to stop his proceedings; and that, he was deterred from engaging in an unnecessary war, not for the want of *support in Parliament*, but by the interference of the people, who loudly expressed their disapprobation of the Minister's conduct, by petitions.

With these and other instances equally striking in their minds, let my countrymen seriously reflect on the nature and pernicious tendency of the bills lately passed into a law. If Lord North's mind had been capable of conceiving the horrid plan of passing a bill, to prevent assemblies of the people, the American war might have been continued years longer, additional millions expended, and the blood of thousands more might have flowed in the contest.---Who durst have petitioned for peace? And the noble Lord might have continued, the rest of his life, at the head of an administration, hostile to the interests and liberties of the country---Who durst have petitioned for his dismissal? Or, if Mr. Pitt had passed a convention bill, previously to his preparing for war with Russia, hostilities with that power would not have been prevented.



vented. Had the people assembled to petition against his proceedings, individuals, through the arbitrary mandate of a corrupt magistrate, might have been condemned to death, without *benefit of clergy*.

To assert, that Mr. Pitt's bill was passed with the *real* view of preventing seditious assemblies, is an insult to common sense: the glaring inconsistency of the Ministers, in treating the subject, is sufficient of itself, to prove the falsehood of the assertion. His Majesty's speech, on the opening of the Parliament, congratulated the House on the peaceable demeanor of his subjects; and Mr. Pitt grounded the necessity of the measure, on the outrage offered to the person of his Majesty, but Mr. Dundas very *candidly* acknowledged, that it had been in contemplation for *months* before.

Those who consider the Minister's embarrassed situation, with respect to the war, will not be at a loss to account for his real motive in passing such a bill. The war has long been unpopular, and many, even of those who originally offered their *lives* and *fortunes*, in defence of its *justice* and *necessity*, are become sick of the contest; and had the right of petitioning remained free and unrestrained, the present majority in Parliament, must soon have yielded to the irresistible voice of the people, in their general cries for an immediate termination of the fatal contest in which we are involved. What indeed will be the ultimate event, Heaven only knows: as far as human foresight can presage, " It is not, nor it cannot, come

to good." But on a subject of this nature, whatever may be the just apprehensions of the enlightened patriot, so many restraints are laid on the simple expressions of truth and sincerity, that scarcely any thing more can remain for him, than to pray that the evils we dread may never visit us; that the whole system of government may be continually directed to preserve inviolate those liberties which still remain to us; to reform abuses; to advance and establish our national freedom; and to make the RIGHTS OF MANKIND, as citizens and individuals, the great foundation on which the virtue, the prosperity, and the glory, of Britain may rise and flourish to the end of time.

F I N I S.



## ERRATA.

- Page 9, l. 4, for *aproaching*, read *approaching*.  
Page 11, l. 46, for *hosterity*, read *posterity*.  
Page 12, l. 12, for *Utretcht*, read *Utrecht*.  
Page 12, l. 31, for *George II.* read *the Reign of George II.*  
Page 19, l. 32, for *his*, read *our*.  
Page 35, l. 46, for *he*, read *they*.  
Page 46, l. 11, for *these*, read *those*.  
Page 58, l. 26, for *achievements on the*, r. *acquisitions by*.

ventured. And the power of the  
truth cannot be over-estimated. Individuals  
throughout the Christian world are at a variety  
of points of view. Some are inclined to

think that the Bible is not  
the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not

the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not

the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not

the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not

the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not

the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not

the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not  
the word of God. It is not